

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/518,113	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NANGLA, KIREN	
	<b>Examiner</b> MATTHEW D. MATZEK	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

**All Participants:**

(1) MATTHEW D. MATZEK.

(2) Chad Hinrichs.

**Date of Interview:** 8 December 2008

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*all discussed*

Claims discussed:

*all discussed*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Lecomte (EP 0 304 351 A1)*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Examiner suggested incorporating claims 2 and 3 into independent claims 1 and 46 to put the claims into condition for allowance. Applicant's representative consulted his client, who agreed to such an amendment.*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Matthew D Matzek/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)